

DD/ASST 584-71

2 March 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Officer, ORD

SUBJECT : Review of "History of the Office of Research and Development, 1962-1968," by [REDACTED] 25X1A9a
25X1A9a [REDACTED] et al, VII Vols., August 1969,
TS Codeword

1. The ORD history consists of a summary volume, supported by six volumes of annexes which describe particular ORD projects. The summary volume is composed of a brief introduction to the establishment of the Directorate which became the DDS&T, followed by short discussions of missions and functions, organization, personnel, and budget. By reliance on tables, charts, and a chronology, the text is kept to minimal length. This spartan, waste-no-words approach works reasonably well in the overall section, with the following exceptions:

a. Part III. Organization, depends on eight charts to show the evolution of the structure of ORD. While these charts are dated, they actually show the organization at the time of each chart, and not necessarily the dates when the changes in organization occurred. Can the dates of these changes be provided from ORD or DDS&T notices? If not, the charts should be used with caution. It is suggested that the charts be supplemented by an additional graphic to trace the evolution of the ORD structure by division, showing when each change took place.

b. At present the history consists of a number of discrete sections, several of which contribute to an understanding of the overall development, such as the statement of missions and functions, the series of organizational charts, and the two graphics on personnel and budget (Figures 10-11, pp. 21-22). These sections show rapid growth, which is further documented by the lists of Major Accomplishments (pp. 23-28) and the chronology of Milestones (pp. 29-30). These data do not, however, give the reader an adequate appreciation for

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~SECRET~~

the kinds of projects to which ORD devoted its resources, the trends in research priorities, recent pressures to contract research expenditures, and the status reached by the end of the period discussed. The magnitudes of these trends might be summarized graphically by a chart showing the changing allocations of people and money (from Figures 10 and 11), for the period covered by the history, to major categories of activity, not necessarily by formal divisions, but in meaningful activity packages. This breakout of data should be accompanied by an explanatory text to account for the changes in allocations. The history would also benefit from a statement of ORD's operating principles showing the basis on which it makes commitments to research including research outside of the state of the art, particularly when such research will have extensive commercial applications which transcend intelligence requirements. In this connection a discussion of ORD's experiences in risk taking in the planning and implementation of its program, and any adjustments of its practices based on its experience along these lines would also be useful. Since the study is a history, the perspective of all of these discussions should be clearly evolutionary.

2. The histories of the individual ORD divisions, which follow the overall section (pp. 38-141), lean strongly in the direction of listing particular projects, providing annual summaries of activities, milestones in divisional accomplishments, and the like. This material, together with the information provided on changes in the organization of the divisions, is of course useful and helps consolidate the record of divisional activities. Much of the information provided is so related to individual projects that it obscures the emerging history of the divisions as a whole. Without purging these histories of their rich foundation of data, they would contribute much more to the understanding of the activities of the Office, if each one also gave more attention to the following considerations:

a. Clear identification of the purpose for which the division was established.

b. More definite dating of when the work of each division was first initiated; identification of the organization under which the work was begun; clarification of the steps in the formal creation of the division (including dates).

c. Review of the range and limits of the major substantive problems with which the division has been concerned, including changes in emphasis in its work, such as between subject areas and in the proportion of effort to pure research and to development.

d. Tracing of changes in the state of the art of the subjects which concern the division.

e. Conclusions which contrast the initial activities of the division with its current and planned responsibilities.

All of these items should be discussed in a dynamic context to show movement and identify when the movement has occurred. Developments should be treated flexibly to reflect when they took place and should not be organized on a year-by-year basis. The increased effort in the text to appreciate the scope and character of the efforts of the division as a whole should then be supplemented by annexes of illustrative material such as the present list of projects, milestones, and the like. Existing lists of projects should be reviewed to insure that initial and terminal dates are shown and all entries in milestones should be dated.

3. No change is recommended in the six volumes of supporting annexes, which document the types of projects engaged in by the ORD divisions. While these annexes vary considerably in their completeness as historical treatments, their revision would be a major undertaking. In their present form they would usefully illustrate the discussion in Volume I, provided they were specifically cited at appropriate points in that discussion. For this purpose they should be provided with tables of contents, and pages now unnumbered should be numbered. More specific comments on the introductory part of Volume I and on the divisional histories are contained in the attached notes.

25X1A9a


Deputy Chief, CIA Historical Staff

Attachment

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

Notes on the "History of the Office of Research and Development, 1962-1968," by [REDACTED] et al, Volume I of VII, August 1969, TS Codeword

P. 1, para 1

Show when the DDR was established. (19 Feb 62)

P. 14, line 6

States that ORD was established in "early 1963." Compare with p. 31, below, which gives the date as 30 July 1962, per HN 1-23.

Pp. 38-72, Analysis Division

The general purpose for which the division was created is well told, but the year-by-year account does not give an appreciation of the extent or direction of the development that has occurred in the mission and activities of the division. Can this be provided in the form of trends in emphasis and in progress achieved in such categories as those which are described on pp. 54-56? The array of listed projects is somewhat overwhelming. How does the division make decisions on the allocation of funds and how does it evaluate progress in its work? Which major goals, if any, have been brought beyond the R&D stage? What changes in goals have occurred and when?

Pp. 69-72

What is the date of Attachment 3 on the Program and Organization of the division?

Pp. 73-89, Applied Physics Division

The goals and program are well outlined and the evolutionary chart is exemplary and might serve as a model for use by the other divisions (pp. 76-77). In Section IV, Major Accomplishments, the general categories of activities are reasonably clear, but do not give much of a sense of the relative emphasis between categories, or changes in major category priorities. The adequacy of summaries in the categories varies. Under A. Audio Surveillance (pp. 80-82), for example, good summaries

25X1C13a

of the developments of [REDACTED] are provided and progress is shown by year. Under B. Emanating Intelligence Collection (pp. 82-83), the presentation states the goals and accomplishments without any reference to time perspective. Succeeding sections vary; a number simply review the accomplishments without reference to when developments occurred.

Pp. 90-102, Biological Sciences Division

The text is much more time conscious than is that of the other division histories, and clearly traces changes in goals and concomitant adjustments in organization (pp. 91-92).

Pp. 95-102

The distinction between the lists of Milestones (pp. 95-98) and accomplishments (pp. 99-102) is not clear. Almost no dates are shown, which greatly reduces the value of the lists.

Pp. 103-109, Medical and Behavioral Sciences Division

Reasons for the change in emphasis of the research program should be more adequately explained and dated (p. 102). In general the extensive employment of technical vocabulary limits the utility of the section to those persons already familiar with the work of the division. The relative importance of key programs is not well differentiated. No dates are attached to the impressive list of accomplishments (pp. 107-109).

Pp. 110-117, Optics Division

The text gives the impression that the Optics Division has concentrated on a relatively few specific tasks and on the whole to tasks which are more within the state of the art than other ORD divisions. The aim appears to have been development and implementation more than basic research. Was this the impression intended?

P. 110, first para, last section.

25X1A9a

How when [REDACTED] became Chief, Optics Division.

Pp. 118-135, Physics - Chemistry Division

Since the name of the division is extremely comprehensive, it would help if a paragraph were inserted to explain the purpose for which the division was established and to define

~~SECRET~~

P. 136, first sentence

Compare this statement that the division was created in February 1963, when [REDACTED] was transferred in from TSD, with the 16 January 1963 date shown in Figure 2, p. 6 above.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~

more precisely its initial and subsequent areas of responsibility. The present discussion is largely limited to the review of particular projects.

P. 118, second para and p. 119, first sentence

Clarify the form in which the activity was initiated in the spring and summer of 1963. How was it organized at this time? When was it first organized as a division and what was it called then?

P. 119, first sentence

Compare also with Figure 4, p. 8 above, which shows it as a division by November 1963. Was this a listing of a status previously established?

Pp. 121-122

These projects should be dated to show time of origin and when appropriate, date of termination.

Pp. 122-124

The presentation of the work as comprising six program areas is very helpful. Have these subject areas always been the topics of major concern to the division? How has emphasis shifted between these areas?

Pp. 125-126, Attachment A

Can this project be defined more explicitly than to collect intelligence against AE plants?

Pp. 132-135, Attachment E

Some of the dating is a little vague. Of all the Attachments, this one describing the mercury battery project, provides the most adequate explanation of what the problem was and how it was solved.

Pp. 136-141, Radio-Physics Division

The mission is clearly described and the narrative provides key dates, but is highly compressed, considering the importance of the subject.

~~SECRET~~